

REMARKS

The Patent Examiner has objected to the drawing for failure to show the additional reflector 7'' as described on page 13, line 23 of the patent specification. This, however, is a typographical error in the patent specification in which 7'' should really be 7'. The number 7' is clearly shown in FIG. 3. Consequently, this amendment to the patent specification should obviate the necessity for a replacement drawing.

The Patent Examiner has also objected to the specification for failure to show reference characters 14', 16, 17 and 18. The patent specification has been amended to correct this. Additionally, the patent specification has also been amended to reference FIG. 3.

The present invention relates to a built-in lamp having a holder for securing the lamp in an installation surface such as a room ceiling. The lamp includes a bulb fitting and reflector having a first reflector region 7 in FIG. 1 or a first reflector region 15 in FIG. 2 as well as a second reflector region 4 (FIG. 1) or 16 (FIG. 2). The second reflector region can be released to permit the lamp bulb to be changed.

A direct light discharge region 1 (FIG. 1) is surrounded by a diffuse light discharge region 2 (FIG. 1) which is located outside the second reflector 4 (FIG. 1). This diffuse light region 2 is terminated by a plate 13 (FIG. 1) which can be released together with the direct light reflector 4 (FIG. 1) secured to it, for example to change the light bulb.

Consequently, the thrust of Applicant's invention is that the plate which covers the lower end of the lamp and the second reflector are attached to each other and thus can be removed from the lamp as a unit to facilitate bulb placement. This aspect of Applicant's invention, furthermore, is clearly defined in the last three lines of claim 1.

The Patent Examiner, however, has rejected previously submitted claim 1, as well as dependent claims 2-7 and 10-16, as unpatentably obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over U.S. Patent No. 7,014,341 to King when combined with U.S. Patent No. 2,244,737 to Stewart. For the reasons set forth below, however, Applicant respectfully submits that this basis for rejection is in error and should be withdrawn. For that reason, claim 1 is resubmitted at this time without amendment, except for the deletion of the number references in the claim to conform to U.S. practices, for reconsideration and allowance by the Patent Examiner.

More specifically, the King patent admittedly discloses a lamp of the type which, like Applicant's invention, is recessed in the ceiling of a room. The King lamp includes a first reflector region 188 (see FIG. 19) as well as a second reflector region 182. Furthermore, as correctly noted by the Patent Examiner, the second reflector 182 can be released from the first reflector 188.

The King patent, however, fails to disclose a plate which covers the bottom of the lamp at all. Rather, as is clear from FIG. 22, the entire bottom of the lamp is completely open.

Since the King patent fails to disclose a plate which covers the bottom of the lamp, the King lamp clearly fails to disclose a plate with the direct discharge reflector attached to it and removable as a unit as is clearly defined in claim 1 of the instant application.

The Patent Examiner's secondary reference to Stewart fails to cure this deficiency of the King patent. More specifically, the Stewart patent is directed to a lamp (see FIG. 12) having a bulb 67 with a lens or diffusing portion 61 which is attached to and covers the bottom of the Stewart lighting fixture. This diffusing portion 61 diffuses the light emitted by the bulb 67.

Unlike Applicant's invention as is clearly defined in claim 1, however, Stewart fails to teach a lower plate having a direct reflector attached to it and which are removable from the

lighting fixture as a unit as is clearly defined in claim 1. Instead, the lower "plate" 61 of Stewart may certainly be removed for bulb replacement, but does not have any reflector, whatsoever, attached to it as disclosed and positively claimed in the instant application.

In short, neither King nor Stewart disclose a lighting fixture having a plate extending across the bottom of the fixture and a reflector attached to that plate. This aspect of Applicant's invention is clearly defined in claim 1. For that reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably defines Applicant's invention over the prior art of record and is, therefore, allowable. All remaining claims depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, also allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for formal allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 07-1180.

Dated: September 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature: /Douglas W. Sprinkle/
Douglas W. Sprinkle

Registration No.: 27,394
GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.
2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330
Post Office Box 7021
Troy, Michigan 48007-7021
(248) 647-6000
(248) 647-5210 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant